

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/051,735	HYRE ET AL.
	Examiner Phylesha L. Dabney	Art Unit 2646

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Phylesha L. Dabney. (3) _____.

(2) Attorney Jensen. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11/15/05 & 12/8/05.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 15,16,37 and 38.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Claims 15-16, and 37-38 has lack of antecedent problems. Attorney sent corrections via an informal fax. Also, it was noted that specification changes submitted on 11/8/04 teaches the frame, diaphragm, air seal, and suspending element as claimed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Fax Cover Sheet

Date: 07 Dec 2005

To: Robert A. Jensen	From: Phylesha L. Dabney
Application/Control Number: 10/051,735	Art Unit: 2646
Fax No.: 206-441-5514	Phone No.: 571-272-7494
Voice No.: 206-448-3200	Return Fax No.: 571-273-7494
Re: Proposed changes to the claims	CC:
<input type="checkbox"/> Urgent <input type="checkbox"/> For Review <input type="checkbox"/> For Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For Reply <input type="checkbox"/> Per Your Request	

Comments:

Please let me know what you think. I will contact you on Thursday to discuss.

Number of pages 2 including this page

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

This facsimile transmission is an Official U.S. Government document which may contain information which is privileged and confidential. It is intended only for use of the recipient named above. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution or copying of this document is strictly prohibited. If this document is received in error, you are requested to immediately notify the sender at the above indicated telephone number and return the entire document in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

Your proposed amendment sent to me on 11/15/05:

Claim 15. An apparatus of Claim 10, with the magnetic field intensity between the gaps regions of higher intensity and those outside the main gap region these regions of substantially similar size and/or magnitude.

Claim 16. An apparatus of Claim 10, with the magnetic field intensity between the gaps regions of higher intensity and those outside the main gap region these regions of substantially different size and/or magnitude.

Claim 37. An apparatus of Claim 10, with an the inter-gap magnetic field intensity between the regions of high intensity less than the gap magnetic field intensity regions of the high intensity.

Claim 38. An, apparatus of Claim 10, with a magnetic field intensity outside the main gap region regions of higher intensity less than the gap magnetic field intensity region of higher intensity.

I proposed to make the following changes:

Claim 15. An apparatus of Claim 10, with the magnetic field intensity between the regions of higher lower intensity and those outside these regions being of substantially similar in size and/or magnitude.

- “higher” was not used in the independent claim, so I have changed the term to –lower-.
- Support for this changes (page 6 lines 6-11). I believe that the applicant is intending to say that the greater intensity regions are supposed to be similar.
- Presently the claim reads as a phrase. I have added –being- and –in- to the claim language.

Claim 16. An apparatus of Claim 10, with the magnetic field intensity between the gaps regions of higher greater intensity and those outside these regions of being substantially different in size and/or magnitude.

- “higher” was not used in the independent claim, so I have changed the term to –greater-.
- Support for this change (page 6 lines 22-25). I believe that the applicant is intending to say that the lower intensity regions may be different.

Claim 37. An apparatus of Claim 10, with the field intensity between the regions of high greater intensity less than the regions of the greater intensity.

Claim 38. An, apparatus of Claim 10, with a magnetic field intensity outside the ~~main gap-region~~ ~~regions of higher intensity~~ less than the ~~gap-magnetic-field-intensity~~ ~~regions of greater intensity~~.

- For claims 37 and 38, “higher” and “high” was not used in the independent claim, so I have changed the term to –greater-.